



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/705,743

11/11/2003

Hong Zhao

213.1143-CIP

4306

7590

10/12/2006

MUSERLIAN, LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP

15th Floor

475 Park Avenue South

New York, NY 10016

EXAMINER

KOSAR, ANDREW D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1654

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/705,743

Applicant(s)

ZHAO ET AL.

Examiner

Andrew D. Kosar

Art Unit

1654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's response filed July 28, 2006 is acknowledged. However, upon further consideration, the previous restriction requirement is withdrawn in favor of the instant requirement.

Claims 1-35 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 14 and 15, drawn to vancomycin-polymer conjugates having a polymer attached at the sugar amine prepared by the method of Group II, classified in class 536, subclass 16.8 or class 514, subclass 9.
- II. Claims 1-10, 13 and 16, drawn to methods of making vancomycin-polymer conjugates of Group I, classified in class 536, subclass 16.8.
- III. Claims 19 and 21-30, drawn to vancomycin-polymer conjugates having a polymer attached at the sugar amine and at the N-methyl amino prepared by the method of Group V, classified in class 536, subclass 16.8 or class 530, subclass 317.
- IV. Claims 17 and 18, drawn to a method of making vancomycin-polymer conjugates having a polymer attached at the sugar amine and at the N-methyl amino, classified in class 536, subclass 16.8.
- V. Claims 31 and 33, drawn to a method of treating a vancomycin susceptible disease in a mammal with the conjugate of claim 21, classified in class 514, subclass 9.

Art Unit: 1654

Please note, claims 11 and 12 have not been included in any grouping, as they are drawn to making a product distinct from that of Group I. Additionally, claims 32, 34 and 35 have not been grouped as they depend from claim 1, a method, while reciting the 'compound of claim 1' and the examiner is unable to ascertain which product the claims properly require in the practice of the method or belong in the kit. Furthermore, claim 20 recites antecedent basis to a method, while it depends from a product, and it cannot be grouped properly

The inventions are independent or distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and III are directed to related products. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed are structurally distinct from each other, having one or two polymers attached at different positions, and would have different effects *in vivo*. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. Inventions III and IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case one could make the instantly claimed products via attachment of the vancomycin core (without the sugar moiety) to a

Art Unit: 1654

polymer-conjugated sugar. Alternatively, one could use a protected vancomycin followed by deprotection to make the products.

Inventions III and V are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case, one could treat a vancomycin susceptible disease with vancomycin or a vancomycin derivative or with a different antibiotic, e.g. bleomycin.

Inventions II and IV are directed to related processes. Inventions IV and V are directed to related processes. The related inventions are distinct if the (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions of Groups II and IV, as claimed, are drawn to methods that make structurally distinct products, such that in practicing one method one would not be making the other product. The inventions of Group IV and V, have different functions/modes of operation, as Group IV is drawn to the method of making the compounds and the method of Group V is drawn to the method of using, wherein the methods have different steps and desired outcomes. Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

Inventions I and IV are directed to an unrelated product and process. Inventions I and V are directed to an unrelated product and process. Inventions III and II are directed to an

Art Unit: 1654

unrelated product and process. Product and process inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that the product cannot be used in, or made by, the process. See MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06.

In the instant case, the product of Group I is not required to be used or made by the processes of Groups IV or V and the product of Group III is not required to be used or made by the processes of Group II.

Inventions II and V are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, in practicing the method of Group II one would not be practicing the method of Group V. The method of making mono-polymerized vancomycin does not require, nor is it required, in the practice of treating vancomycin susceptible conditions with di-polymerized vancomycin.

The search for each of the above inventions is not co-extensive particularly with regard to the non-patented literature search. A reference which would anticipate the invention of one group would not necessarily anticipate or even make obvious another group.

Additionally, the compounds of the instant application are distinct, absent evidence to the contrary, and would require a unique search strategy. The search for the distinct compounds is conducted based on their chemical structure. Therefore, the search of one chemical structure would not necessarily lead to the discovery of another structure, nor would it necessarily lead to the discovery of methods of using and/or making.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above, the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02) and the search for one invention would not necessarily lead to the discovery of another invention, restriction for

Art Unit: 1654

examination purposes as indicated is proper, and to not restrict would be an undue burden on the Examiner.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

Claims 1-9, 14 and 16 are generic to the myriad of patentably distinct species of mono-polymer-vancomycin conjugates, too numerous to recited individually, including the species specifically recited in claims 10 and 15.

Claims 17-19, 21-23, 25-30, 31 and 33 are generic to the myriad of patentably distinct species of di-polymer-vancomycin conjugates, too numerous to recited individually, including the species specifically recited in claim 24.

The species are independent or distinct because they are structurally distinct and would be expected to function differently *in vivo* and each structure would require a separate search.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. To be considered fully responsive, Applicant must identify a single product where all variables are specifically defined, and if Applicant elects the method of making, the starting materials must also be specifically identified. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Art Unit: 1654

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.


Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Art Unit: 1654

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew D. Kosar whose telephone number is (571)272-0913. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 08:00 - 16:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecilia J. Tsang can be reached on (571)272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


Andrew D Kosar
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1654